

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/111,915

Applicant(s)

Boggs et al

Examiner

Richard W. Ward

Group Art Unit

1723



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Richard W. Ward

(3) _____

(2) Andrew Kolomayets

(4) _____

Date of Interview Jul 23, 2001Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Claim(s) discussed: 46, 56, and 66

Identification of prior art discussed:

Sugiyama et al [432]Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The examiner indicated to applicant the presence of 35 USC 112 issues within the instant claims, and further indicated that the independent claims were still rejectable over the art of record. Applicant elected not to make any amendments at this time.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.